REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-27 were pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for further consideration.

Rejection Under 35 USC §102(e) Based on Canna et al.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13, 14, 15, and 20-27 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by Canna et al. (USP 6,464,594). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants first will discuss claims 1-6, 8-10, 22, and 23 and then will discuss claims 13, 14, 15, and 24-27.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 22, and 23

Claim 1 defines a child swing that includes, among other things, "components that are movable relative to the support structure" and "a support member coupled to at least one of the [movable] components." The "components" of claim 1 include a seat. According to claim 1, "motion is imparted to the support member by swinging of the seat." Thus, the support member is coupled to a component that is movable so that the support member moves when the seat swings.

Canna et al. does not teach or suggest such a support member. The Office Action identifies the connector structure 302 of Canna et al. as a support member. The connector structure 302, however, is not coupled to a movable component of the swing. Connector structure 302 is part of an entertainment member 300. The entertainment member 300 is attached to a receiving member 200 that, in turn, is attached to an upper structure 101 of the

swing 100 (see FIG. 4). The upper structure 101 and the receiving member 200 are not movable relative to the support structure (e.g., legs 103) of the swing 100. Therefore, the connector structure 302 is not coupled to a movable component of the swing and does not move by swinging of the seat. Because Canna et al. does not teach or suggest "a support member coupled to at least one of the [movable] components, . . . wherein motion is imparted to the support member by swinging of the seat," as required by claim 1, Applicants submit that Canna et al. does not anticipate claim 1 or its dependent claims 2-6 and 8-10 under 35 USC §102(e).

Like claim 1, claim 22 defines a swing that includes, among other things, "components that are movable relative to the support structure" and "a support member coupled to at least one of the [movable] components." The "components" of claim 22 include a seat. According to claim 22, "motion is imparted to the support member by swinging of the seat." Thus, like claim 1, the support member is coupled to a component that is movable so that the support member moves when the seat swings. Applicants submit that claim 22 and its dependent claim 23 are not anticipated by Canna et al. under 35 USC §102(e) for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 13, 14, 15, and 24-27

Claim 13 defines a swing "wherein [an] object hanger is so arranged relative to the seat that motion is imparted to the object hanger by swinging of the seat."

Canna et al. does not teach or suggest such a swing. The Office Action identifies entertainment device 300 as an object hanger. As explained above, the entertainment device 300 of Canna et al. is not arranged relative to the seat 105 such that motion is imparted to the entertainment device 300 by swinging of the seat 105. Rather, the entertainment device 300, which is attached to upper structure 101 of the swing 100, can remain still as the seat 105 swings. The entertainment device 300 can be located within reach of a child located in the swing seat 105 (see col. 3, lines 25-27), so a child could cause motion of the entertainment device 300. Swinging of the seat 105, however, does not cause motion of the entertainment

device 300. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 13 is not anticipated by Canna et al. under 35 USC §102(e).

Like claim 13, claims 14, 15, 24, and 26 each define a swing "wherein the object hanger is so arranged relative to the seat that motion is imparted to the object hanger by swinging of the seat." Applicants submit that claims 14, 15, 24, and 26, and dependent claims 25 and 27, are not anticipated by Canna et al. under 35 USC §102(e) for at least the same reason as claim 13.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Based on Canna et al. and Clouser

Claims 7, 11, and 12, which depend from claim 1, are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Canna et al. in view of Clouser (USP 1,390,502). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reason.

Even if Canna et al.'s swing were modified with the toy bar of Clouser, as suggested in the Office Action, that modified swing would not result in the invention of claim 1 and, hence, the inventions of claims 7, 11, and 12. For example, claim 1 defines a swing that includes an object hanger, and the object hanger comprises a support member (defined in claims 7, 11, and 12 as a toy bar), a hanger coupled to the support member, and a decorative object. Clouser does not teach or suggest a hanger coupled to the support member, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 11, and 12 under 35 USC §103(a).

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Based on Sonner et al. and Harris

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Sonner et al. (USP 6,386,986) in view of Harris (USP 5,370,570). Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 16 defines a swing "wherein the object hanger is so arranged relative to the seat that motion is imparted to the object hanger by the swinging of the seat." As conceded in the

Office Action, Sonner fails to teach an object hanger. To cure this deficiency, the Office Action turns to Harris, stating that "Harris teaches an object hanger (8) that could be mounted on a crib *or cradle* and the hanger could be adjusted in various locations and one of the locations is offset from the longitudinal axis of the crib. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the swing of Sonner et al with the object hanger of Harris for the purpose of entertaining a child." (Emphasis added.) Applicants disagree.

Contrary to the statement in the Office Action, Harris does not teach that its support system 8 can be attached to a swinging object, such as a cradle. Harris does describe that its support system 8 can be attached to a crib. The term "crib," however, is commonly understood in the art to be stationary, not swinging. For example, U.S. Patent No. 5,553,337 distinguishes a stationary crib from a swinging cradle (see lines 1-6 of Abstract: "An electric cradle including a crib, a main support disposed under the crib to support the crib and two swinging frames pivotally connecting the main support with two ends of the crib. A swinging mechanism is used to swing the swinging frames so as to swingingly drive the crib to form an electric cradle. . . . In addition, the height of the side fences of the cribs can be adjusted to meet the standing height of an infant, whereby the electric cradle can be transformed into a fixed crib."; see also col. 2, lines 34-41). In the '337 patent, the otherwise stationary crib is outfitted with a swinging mechanism to form an electric, swinging cradle. The term "crib" also would be understood in the context of Harris to be stationary. Harris only discusses non-swinging structures, namely, a crib, a playpen, a bed, a stroller, a counter top, an automobile window, a chair, a table, a car seat, and a high chair. Significantly, swings are not included in this rather exhaustive list. Apart from Applicants' own disclosure, there simply is no suggestion to place the support system 8 of Harris on a swinging object, such as the swing of Sonner et al.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16, and its dependent claims 17-19, under 35 USC §103(a).

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 CFR 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 CFR 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 3, 2005

By Mary Michelle Kile

Mary Michelle Kile
Registration No. 35,217
Attorney for Applicant

Customer Number: 22428
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
3000 K Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143

Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399